1		
2		
3		
4		
5	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6 7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	DAPHNE CHAU,	
10	Plaintiff, v.	No. C 13-04806 WHA
11	II EMIC CORPORATION, a Massachusetts	ODDED DE DECDONCE EDOM
12	corporation, EMC PERIPHERALS, INC., a California corporation, KRISTIE DREW, NICOLE DESMARAIS, SHAYNA	ORDER RE RESPONSE FROM ATTORNEY KEEGAN
13	FISHER, IVY MILLMAN, and DAVID	
14		
15	Defendants.	
16		

In regards to yesterday's order to show cause (Dkt. No. 27), plaintiff's attorney Dru Anne Keegan submitted a response, stating that she has "experienced tremendous family difficulties during the month of November, 2013" and that because "Defendants stipulated to delaying [her] client's response time, [she] assumed [her] client had more time to respond" to defendants' two motions (Dkt. No. 28). Although the record does not show that defendants ever made such a stipulation, this order will not punish plaintiff for her counsel's failure to adhere to deadlines.

Accordingly, Attorney Keegan must file her responses to defendants' two motions, as described in the order to show cause, by no later than **12 PM ON NOVEMBER 29**. Failure to submit timely responses to defendants' motions will result in immediate dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 26, 2013.

